

November 8, 2000

Mr. Leonard W. Peck, Jr. Assistant General Counsel Texas Department of Criminal Justice P.O. Box 4004 Huntsville, Texas 77342

OR2000-4352

Dear Mr. Peck:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act, chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 141053.

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (the "department") received two requests for copies of a specified sexual harassment investigation file. You claim that the information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." The common law right of privacy is incorporated into the Public Information Act by section 552.101. For information to be protected by common law privacy it must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The *Industrial Foundation* court held that information is excepted from disclosure if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Id.* at 685.

In Morales v. Ellen, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.--El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the right of common law privacy to files of an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in Ellen contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. Ellen, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. Id. In concluding, the Ellen court

held that "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.* 

After reviewing the submitted information, we conclude that the submitted documents contain an adequate summary of the sexual harassment complaint investigation; therefore, based on *Ellen*, the summary must be released, with the victim's and witnesses' identities redacted. In addition to the redacted summary, the accused's separate statement must be released with the victim's and witnesses' identities redacted. Finally, the victim's and witnesses' separate statements must be withheld. We have marked the information that must be redacted prior to release.

The department also claims that section 552.108 excepts the information at issue. Section 552.108 reads, in pertinent part:

- (a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:
  - (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;
- (b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:
  - (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution;

However, you admit that "this matter was handled from the beginning as a personnel matter by the EEOC function of the [department]." Further, the department states that "these facts are probably not prosecutable as a criminal matter." Additionally, we note that the documents themselves reveal that this was an investigation of violations of department policy, and not criminal conduct. Therefore, section 552.108 is inapplicable to the submitted documents. See Ellen, 840 S.W.2d at 526.

Finally, we address the department's argument under section 552.117(3). The requested records contain information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.117(3). The department must withhold those portions of the summary that reveal the department

employees' home addresses, home telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information. We have marked examples of the types of information that must be withheld.<sup>1</sup>

In summary, we have marked the summary of the sexual harassment investigation and the accused's statement, both of which must be released with the section 552.117(3) information and victim and witness identifiers redacted. The remaining information must be withheld under section 552.101.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The department also seeks a previous determination as to the confidential nature of this type of information. We decline to issue such a determination at this time.

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

Amanda Crawford

Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

AEC/er

Ref:

ID# 141053

Encl:

Submitted documents

cc:

Mr. Joe Rojas 2204 Taylor Street

Wichita Falls, Texas 76309

(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Denissa Thompson 12691 FM 368 South Iowa Park, Texas 76367 (w/o enclosures)